





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademerk Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/625,993  | 07/26/2000    | Kyoko Higashino      | Q60072                  | 8492             |
| 75  | 90 10/17/2002 |                      |                         |                  |
| Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas                                |               |                      | . EXAMINER              |                  |
| 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037 GONZALEZ, JULI |               | Z, JULIO C           |                         |                  |
|   |               |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |               |                      | 2834                    | 20               |
|   |               |                      | DATE MAILED: 10/17/2002 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |                        |
|---|--|--|------------------------|
| Advisory Action   | 09/625,993   | HIGASHINO ET AL.   |                        |
| Advisory Addion   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |                        |
|   | Julio C. Gonzalez  | 2834   |                        |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address -  |                        |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in a condition under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which  | ation. A proper reply to a<br>n places the application in          | ı<br>n                 |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |                        |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date   |  |  |                        |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing  | g date of the final rejection.                                     |                        |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a). | of extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>be later than three months after the mai | unt of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final Office | e extension action; or |
| <ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>   | •  |  |                        |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:  |  |                        |
| (a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (   | see NOTE below);   |                        |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | elow);   |  |                        |
| <ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>   | n better form for appeal by mate   | rially reducing or simplify  | ing the                |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceli   | ng a corresponding number of f   | inally rejected claims.  |                        |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .   |  |  |                        |
| <ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti</li></ol>  | on(s):   |  |                        |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed amer   | ndment                 |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec  |  | dered but does NOT plac  | ce the                 |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t   | o issues which were new  | <i>i</i> ly            |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |  |  | n                      |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |  |                        |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |  |                        |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |  |                        |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 9-18.  |  |  |                        |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |  |                        |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is  | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp   | roved by the Examiner.   |                        |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   | ' o-   |                        |
| 10.  Other:   |  | 11/1   |                        |
|   |  | NESTOR RAMIREZ   | AMINER                 |

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)





Application No. 009/625,993

Continuation of 2. NOTE: amending the claim as such changes the scope of the claim and further narrows the invention such as the wide tooth being in teeth of alternating width.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: According to claim 1, it is disclosed a single piece stator core formed as a lamination of a plurality of sheet-shaped magnetic members. The claim discloses a single piece, yet the stator core is also formed of a plurality of magnetic members. It may seem like if the claim contradicts itself. The claim is not specific enough as to define a stator core being formed of one entire or circumferentially piece for the stator core.